REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-16, 18-26 and 28-36 were examined in the final office action mailed on 09/12/2008 (hereafter "Final Office Action"). All the claims were rejected.

5   By virtue of this paper, the specification and claims 1, 2, 4-6, 10-12, 14-16, 20-22, 24-26, 30-32 and 34-36 are sought to be amended. The amendments are believed not to introduce new subject matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. The amendments are made without prejudice or disclaimer.

10   Claims 1-6, 8-16, 18-26 and 28-36 are thus respectfully presented for reconsideration in view of the below remarks.

Official Notice

In page 4 line 14 to page 5 line 3 of the First Final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that
15   certain statements are taken admitted prior art as not being traversed in the previous response.

The point is rendered moot in view of the amendments to the respective claims 5-6, 15-16, 25-26 and 35-36.

20   ### *Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112*

Claims 2, 12, 22 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The rejections are rendered moot in view of the foregoing amendments.

25   To advance prosecution it is respectfully noted that the amended claim 2 recites, "... another program logic constituting said sequence of built-in tasks is used by many users including said user,...".

The amendment thus expressly clarifies that the built-in tasks are used by many users,
30   while the custom tasks are provided by the specific users using the corresponding instance of the program logic specified by the user.

Such a feature is inherent to the software development and usage cycle in the environment

of the present invention, as would be apparent to one skilled in the relevant arts.

Applicants first set out the relevant standard in examining the amended claims with respect

to the written description requirement:

5
            While there is *no in haec verba* [*emphasis* in original]
            requirement, newly added claim limitations must be supported in
            the specification through express, **implicit, or inherent
            disclosure.**
            (MPEP Section 2163.I.B. New or Amended Claims, **Emphasis Added**)
10

Based on the above, it is believed that the applicable law/practice expressly recognizes that

the precisely same words need not be present in the originally filed specification, and the written

description requirement would be satisfied if the amended language would be understood to be

implicit or inherence in the original disclosure.

15

Finally, it is important to be mindful of the generally inverse correlation between the level

of skill and knowledge in the art and the specificity of disclosure necessary to satisfy the written

description requirement. (MPEP §§ 2163(II)(A)(2)) (inventions in ""predictable"" or ""mature""

require a lesser showing of possession than inventions in more ""unpredictable"" arts).

20

Withdrawal of the rejections with respect to 35 U.S.C. § 112 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102/103

Claims 1, 3-4, 8-11, 13-14, 18-21, 23-24, 28-31 and 33-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C.

25   § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 5,774,661 issued to Chatterjee *et al*

(hereafter "Chatterjee"). Claims 2, 5-6, 12, 15-16, 22, 25-26, 32 and 35-36 are rejected under

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chatterjee) in view of Bianco (US Patent

#6,345,359).

30   Without acquiescing to any of the assertions in the First Final Office Action, it is

respectfully noted that the presented claims are allowable over the art of record.

As to Applicable law, it is noted that the Office is permitted to give each term in the claim

its broadest **reasonable** construction **consistent with the specification**. Phillips v. AWH Corp.,

35   415 F.3d 1303, 75 USPQ2d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2005). The PTO determines the scope of claims in

patent applications not solely on the basis of the claim language, but upon giving claims their broadest reasonable construction "in light of the specification as it would be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the art." In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech. Ctr., 367 F.3d 1359, 1364[, 70 USPQ2d 1827] (Fed. Cir. 2004).

5

As a threshold matter, Chatterjee does not teach or reasonably suggest the concept of custom tasks (as would be appreciated by one skilled in the relevant arts). This is because Chatterjee relates to a work flow editor, where a single user has the ability to modify/ define work flows of interest to incorporate desired program logics/tasks.

10

Under the required reasonable construction legal standard noted above, one skilled in the relevant arts would not find the claimed custom tasks in the disclosure of Chatterjee (as also further defined in claim 2). The Examiner's interpretation in the previous office action was unreasonable.

15

Secondly, it is noted that independent claim 1 is directed to synchronization/ consolidation of data between at least two data sources. This feature is expressly recited in the body of amended claim 1 also and thus the Examiner is requested to continue examination giving the feature patentable weight.

20

Furthermore, the extension points of the present invention have the inherent feature that the execution of the work flow continue from the extension point, while providing for execution of the custom task associated with the extension point. This feature is expressly recited in the amended independent claims.

25

In sharp contrast, Chatterjee does not contemplate the claimed extension points because there is no inherent requirement that execution continue from the extension points. Rather, Chatterjee provides the user/editor to define any desired flow based on decision points. In support of this position, Applicants point to the below disclosure of Chatterjee:

30   Turning now to the example workflow of builder display
            300, this workflow commences by data entry 311 for a new
            purchase order. Execution of "data frm entry" object 311
            provides the user with a prompt to enter data. In this case, the
            data requested is purchase order data, defined using workflow
35   administrator 216. Next, decision point 312 checks such data for

certain properties, defined by the user in a manner described
in connection with FIG. 4. *As a result of this decision point
312, work flow processing will be routed either for further data
entry 313 or to connection object "Accepted PO Path" 317.* In the
latter case, connection object "Accepted PO Path" 317 joins data
from decision point 312 and decision point 314, database
retrieval object 318 accesses a selected database and retrieves
a specific record therefrom, and icons 319 and 320 indicate that
the workflow is complete. Otherwise, data entry object 313
prompts the user for further input, *decision point object 314
provides routing in response to the input data, and as a result
the workflow either progresses to connection object Accepted PO
Path317, indicating acceptance, or to work basket object 315,
indicating rejection.* In the latter event, work basket object
315 performs further processing, such as presenting a purchase
order to a particular user as a rejected purchase order, at
which point the work flow is complete, as indicated by icon 316.
(Col 7 line 57 to col 8 line 14, *Emphasis Added*)

Accordingly, currently amended independent claim 1 is allowable over the art of record.
Claims 2-6 and 8-10 depend from claim 1, and are allowable at least for the reasons noted above
with respect to claim 1.

Currently amended independent claims 11, 21, and 31 are also allowable over the art of
record at least for some of the reasons noted above with respect to claim 1. Other claims are also
allowable over the art of record at least for depending from an allowable independent claim.

Conclusion

Accordingly all the objections and rejections of record are believed to be overcome.
Continuation of examination is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the
undersigned representative at 707.356.4172 if it is believed that an interview might be useful for
any reason.

Respectfully submitted,
/Narendra Reddy Thappeta/
Signature
Date: December 12, 2008   Printed Name: Narendra Reddy Thappeta
Attorney for Applicant
Registration Number: 41,416